

**REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 4, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 12, 14, 18, 19, and 21 have been amended, and no claims have been cancelled or added; as a result, claims 1-21 remain pending in this application.

**§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by McAlear (US 6,389,029).

McAlear discusses a system in which various computers 130 coupled to a USB hub 140, which is in turn coupled by a USB link 152 to an attachment unit 154. The attachment unit is coupled to a network, which in turn is coupled via end hubs 80 and USB links 84 to remote USB devices 100. It is particularly significant that the computer 130 communicates externally via a USB connection to an external attachment unit 110.

In the pending claims, a driver running on a host computer emulates a local USB port, and does not use an actual physical local USB port to communicate with the remote server. The host computer's driver emulates the remote port as a port local to the host computer by exchanging data with the remote server which does have one or more USB ports as reflected in the claims, such that the remote server's USB port is emulated by the driver on the host computer which needs not have a USB port physically present.

It is argued in the Office Action that emulation of remote ports as local ports is somehow inherent, despite such a feature not being present in McAlear. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that should these claims be again rejected, references showing each element of the pending claims be cited so that they can be fully considered and distinguished from the claims of the present invention, and so that motivation for combination of references can be properly considered.

Applicant further notes that claims 1, 8, 12, 12, 14, 18, 19, and 21 have been amended so that the claim language is more grammatically correct and consistent in number, with the intent of making the claims easier to read and understand.

Because the cited McAlear reference fails to consider emulation of a USB port in a driver that is operable to communicate with a remote server, and for the other reasons presented above, the pending claims are each patentably distinct from the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

**§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 3, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAlear.

These claims depend from claims shown above to be distinct from the cited art, and so are allowable as they stand as dependent on allowable base claims. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 349-9581 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN A. KLEIN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 349-9581

Date

Nov. 4 05

By



John M. Dahl

Reg. No. 44,639

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 4th day of November, 2005.

PATRICIA A. HULTMAN

Name

Signature

